

Remarks

Applicants have carefully considered the Office Action dated April 19, 2004 and the references cited therein. Applicants respectfully request reexamination and reconsideration of the application.

Applicants acknowledge the Examiners comments regarding specification and the use of the JAVA trademark. Applicants has reviewed the use of the JAVA trademark throughout the specification and determined that generic terminology is utilized with the trademark in a majority of the instances thereof. Applicants will provide a replacement specification for the Examiner's consideration upon an indication of allowable subject matter, and respectfully request that any objections to the specification regarding the same be held in abeyance until such time.

Claims 1-14 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,430,569, Bracha et al., hereafter Bracha, in view of US Patent 6,654,793, Wollrath et al., hereafter Wollrath. In setting forth the rejection, the Examiner has cited the same sections of Bracha which are alleged to disclose the limitation of claims 1, 7 and 11, as well as their respective dependent claims. However, the Examiner has also expressly admitted that Bracha fails to disclose a data structure for recording a constraint has asymmetric relationship between two class loaders. Instead, the Examiner is relying on Wollrath, alleging that Wollrath discloses a technique whereby the server maintains information regarding the classes and loaders, and, further, that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Bracha's invention of class loaders and constraint checking mechanism to include Wollrath's invention of a server maintaining information regarding the classes and loaders because networked systems are common and enforcing the constraints with respect to multiple class files is important for proper program operation.

After reviewing the sections of Wollrath cited by the Examiner, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) on the grounds that the Examiner has failed to create a *prima facie* case of obviousness. In accordance with MPEP §2143.03, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness 1) the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest *all* of the claim

limitations; 2) there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify a reference or combine references; and 3) there must be a reasonable expectation of success.

Claim 1, specifically recites an object-oriented computer system comprising “means for creating a data structure for recording a constraint as an *asymmetric* relationship between two class loaders, wherein said data structure comprises ... a first parameter denoting the class file which is identified by a descriptor in said symbolic reference, and a second parameter denoting the class loader which loaded said another class file” (claim 1, lines 10-16). The sections of Wollrath cited by the Examiner as disclosing a server maintains information regarding the classes and loaders (Wollrath, col. 2, lines 58-64; col. 6, lines 47-52; and col. 8, lines 18-25), even if assumed to disclose the subject matter as alleged, which applicants do not agree with, do not provide the teaching missing from Bracha, i.e. a data structure for recording a constraint has asymmetric relationship between two class loaders. Instead, Wollrath discloses a stub retrieval and loading subsystem for use in connection with a remote method invocation system to facilitate invocation of a remote method by program executing an execution environment (Wollrath, col. 2, lines 47-53). Neither the stump, as described (Wollrath, col. 2, lines 14-20; col. 8, lines 18-25), nor the skeleton 32 (Wollrath, col. 6, lines 47-52) specifically described a data structure that comprises a first parameter denoting the class file which is identified by a descriptor in said symbolic reference, and a second parameter denoting the class loader which loaded said another class file. Such limitation is disclosed in great detail in the subject specification (page 36, line 20 - page 41, line 14; Figs. 5 and 6A-6E). That Wollrath may disclose maintaining information regarding classes and loaders and does not teach the specific limitation recited in claim 1 regarding the data structure, and its parameters, is truly recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the Examiner has failed to indicate where the combined teachings of Wollrath and Bracha disclose such a limitation, and, that claim 1 is patentable over Bracha and Wollrath, whether considered singularly or in combinations. Claims 2-6 include all of the limitations of claim 1 and are likewise believed patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, as well as for the merits of their own respective limitations.

Method claims 7 and 11 include language substantially similar to claim 1 and, along with their respective dependent claims, as applicable, are likewise believed patentable over Bracha and Wollrath, whether considered singularly or in combinations, for at least the same reasons as claim 1, as well as for the merits of their own respective limitations (claims 7, lines 11-15; claim 11, lines 9-15).

Applicants respectfully reassert all of the arguments and traversals set forth in prior responses to the extent still relevant to the outstanding rejections, particularly with regard to dependent claims 2-3, 6, 8-9 and 12. Claim 2 recites the data structure as further including "a third parameter denoting the object reference to said class file which is identified by a descriptor in said symbolic reference" (claim 2, lines 2-3). Similarly, claim 3 recites the data structure as further including "a fourth parameter, denoting the object reference to said class file which is identified by a descriptor in said symbolic reference" (claim 3, lines 2-3). The sections of Bracha cited by the Examiner (col. 5, lines 8-12 and 15) do not disclose parameters that are analogous to those recited in claims 2 and 3, respectively. In this regard, Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to Figure 5 of the subject application and its accompanying description. In addition to the reasons set forth with respect to the traversal of the rejection of claim 1, Applicants additionally assert that the Examiner has failed to indicate where Bracha discloses the limitations of third and fourth parameter stored within the data structure as recited in claims 2 and 3, respectively.

In addition, claim 6 recites "each class loader has its own cache, and the data structure for a class loader is stored in the cache for that class loader" (claim 6, lines 1-3). In this regard, Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to Figures 6A-6E of the subject application and its accompanying description. The sections of Bracha cited by the Examiner as disclosing the limitations of claim 6 (col. 3, lines 49-52 and col. 5, lines 6-8) are actually believed to teach away from the invention. In Bracha, the loaded class cache (LCC) maps a class name and an initiating class loader to a runtime representation of the class. The class name and initiating class loader constitute a key into the loaded class cache (col. 5, lines 8-11). Accordingly, in addition to the reasons set forth with respect to the traversal of the rejection of claim 1, Applicants additionally assert that the Examiner has failed to indicate where Bracha discloses the limitations of

claim 6. Claims 8 and 12 include language substantially similar to claim 6 and are likewise believed patentable over Bracha, or any other reference of record, whether considered singularly or in combinations, for at least the same reasons as claim 6 as well as for the merits of their own respective limitations.

Claims 8-9 include all of the limitations of claim 7 and are likewise believed patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 7, as well as for the merits of their own respective limitations. Similarly, claims 8-9 include all of the limitations of claim 11 and are likewise believed patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 11, as well as for the merits of their own respective limitations.

Applicants believe the claims are in allowable condition. A notice of allowance for this application is solicited earnestly. If the Examiner has any further questions regarding this amendment, he/she is invited to call Applicant's attorney at the number listed below. The Examiner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any balances under 37 CFR §1.17, and 1.16 to Deposit Account No. DA-12-2158.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: 7/15/04

Bruce D. Jobse, Esq. Reg. No. 33,518
KUDIRKA & JOBSE, LLP
Customer Number 021127
Tel: (617) 367-4600 Fax: (617) 367-4656